

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 28 September 2004. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1 – 5 have been amended to correct the language thereof.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner stated that the feature of “being provided with a groove in the bottom portion [of] each hinge ...”, as claimed in Claim 1, must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claims.

Claims have been amended to call for the groove to be located in the bottom of the -- temple extension --, as kindly suggested by the Examiner. Thus, the claims now coincide with that which is shown in the drawings. Therefore, no drawing changes are required.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification because it appeared that the reference to the groove 11 being formed in the hinge was inaccurate, as the drawings indicated the groove being formed in the temple extensions.

Accordingly, the Specification has been amended to replace the reference to the groove being formed in the hinges with -- temple extension --, as shown in the drawings. No new matter has been added by these changes.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 1 due to an informality therein, the reference to the groove being formed in each hinge, and Claims 1 – 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicated a number of terms which were unclear. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The claims have been amended to correct the language thereof. The alternative language has been removed and the claims now accurately define the -- temple extension -- as a location in which the groove is formed. Additionally, the reference to “the best” has been cancelled from the claims. Therefore, it is believed that the claims now particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 21 Dec. 2004

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.
04586